



Utah School Readiness Board

Meeting Minutes

<https://www.utah.gov/pmn/sitemap/notice/855043.html>

Wednesday, September 6, 2023

1:00 pm – 3:00 pm

Location: Department of Workforce Services
720 South 200 East
SLC, UT 84111
Conference Room 100

The following link will take you to the power point which was shared throughout the meeting which may be helpful while reading through the

minutes: <https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/1017607.pdf>

Link to the agenda:

<https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/1015621.pdf>

Link to the audio recording:

<https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/1018801.m4a>

Board Member Attendees: Jeremias Solari, Rebecca Banner, Trent Kaufman, Seung- Hee Claire Son, Annie Frazier, Amy Terpstra, Jamie Bitton, Marie Steffensen, Mark Innocenti, Sara Wiebke for Jennifer Throndsen, Linda Chadburn,

Excused Board Members:

Other Attendees: Ashley Trujillo, Megan Vlaming, Rima Whited, Emma Moench, Samantha Mafua, Amie, Haley Bemis, Kimber Burks, Taryn Roch, Katrina

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	RECOMMENDATIONS and ACTION
Welcome	I. Jeremias Solari welcomed the group. A. <i>The following link will take you to the power point which was shared throughout</i>	

	<p><i>the meeting which may be helpful while reading through the minutes:</i></p> <p>https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/1017607.pdf</p>	
Approval of Minutes	<p>I. Approval of 5/24/2023 drafted meeting minutes</p> <p>https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/1018803.pdf</p>	<p>Jeremias Solari called for a motion to approve the draft meeting minutes. Amy Terpstra requested adjustments to motions recorded due to a duplicate motion. Jermias made a motion to approve 5/24/2023 meeting minutes with adjustments. Amy Terpstra seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously. Minutes approved.</p>
Board Membership Update	<p>Megan Vlaming</p> <p>I. New board member:</p> <p>A. Linda Chadburn- Person with expertise in early childhood education.</p> <p>II. Majority of seats expire on June 30, 2024.</p> <p>A. Megan Vlaming and Ashley Trujillo will be reaching out to confirm continuation or replacements.</p>	
Overview of SR Board Admin Rules and Robert's Rules of Order	<p>Elliot Lawrence</p> <p>I. R995 code can be found at: https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/538157.pdf</p> <p>II. Parliamentary Procedure - Robert's Rules of Order</p> <p>A. Purpose</p> <p>B. Not Used To</p> <p>C. General Principles</p> <p>D. Agenda</p> <p>E. Proposing Motions</p> <p>F. Amendments and Disposition</p> <p>G. Voting and Disposition</p> <p>III. Conflict of Interest Review</p> <p>A. What is a conflict of interest?</p> <p>1. If you have a conflict of interest you can recuse yourself or seek clarification from the chair or someone with the authority to decide if it is a conflict of interest.</p> <p>B. Substantial Conflict of Interest</p> <p>C. Disclosure of Potential Conflicts</p> <p>All information presented for this section can be found at:</p> <p>https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/1017607.pdf</p>	

	Handbook for Members of the State of Utah Boards and Commissions	
SY 2022-2023 Pay for Success Update	<p>Mark Innocenti</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. During this implementation they really looked at the high-risk group. II. It is based on the premise that all high-risk students will need special education at some point in their school career during the first 7 years of school (k-6). III. It is not a traditional educational evaluation. The purpose was to monitor that the conditions of the loan were met. IV. Jamie Bitton had a question if there was a change in participation with COVID. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Mark Innocenti informed her that they did not look at it differently. V. Claire Son had a question as to if there were second language learners. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Mark Innocenti informed her that there was and it was looked at during the evaluation. The contract owners did not really look at this and were comfortable moving forward. <p>Joe Edman</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Investor Repayment is \$515,034.90 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Some kids were eligible in cohort 3. They already met the CAP last year and will not be eligible for additional payout. B. There are two payments left. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. \$257,108 2. \$257,926.90 I. Open Board and SR Team discussion was opened for the payout provided. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. No discussion. II. Public Comment was opened. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. No public comment. <p>All information presented for this section can be found at: https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/1017607.pdf</p>	<p>Jeremias Solari called for a motion to approve the recommended payout budget. Trent Kaufman made a motion to approve the budget. Amy Terpstra seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously. Motion approved.</p>
SB 003, New Application Process	<p>Emma Moench and Jared Lisonbee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Senate Bill 003- Legislature just passed with a new language for the School Readiness Initiative that will change our application process to a one step application process. II. Application suggestion is to equally weigh narrative, academic, and observation scores and remove the requirement of an ECERS-3 threshold score of ESA grant. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Narrative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Documentation of programs meeting all elements of High-Quality Early Learning as designated by code. 2. Up to XX points. 3. Priority points will be given to those currently on grant. 	<p>1st motion- Trent Kaufman motioned to not equally weigh them with the Narrative not to be considered. The weighting is to be 50% Academic, 25% ECERS, 25% PEEP. Amy seconded. The motion was 4 to 6. The motion did not pass.</p> <p>2nd motion- Rebecca Banner put in a motion that the board accept the</p>

- B. Academic (PEEP Progress Scores)
 - 1. Up to XX points for:
 - a) Percentage of "At Risk" population at the time of application.
 - b) Range to threshold for both Literacy and Numeracy.
- C. Observation (ECERS-3 Scores)
 - 1. XX points: meets minimum threshold
 - 2. 0 points: does not meet minimum threshold
- D. Questions regarding this section.
 - 1. Amy Terpstra asked if the narrative is the application?
 - a) Jared Lisonbee answered yes along with the PEEP Score and ECERS-3 Scores, the narrative really speaks to the requirements for the High Quality and provides the applicants with a chance to really show how they meet the requirements of High Quality. The team met for a preliminary discussion on options to match what we have with the legislation.
 - 2. Sarah Weikbe asked whether the equal waiting came from code or the group?
 - a) Emma Moench answered that the one step process is coming from code. Jared Lisonbee added all the components are in code and the weight is to be decided by the board.
 - 3. Rebecca Banner asked if we want to include the PEEP scoring threshold?
 - a) Jared Lisonbee answered that because the PEEP puts English learners at a disadvantage and serious equity issues with that, the team recommends not having that strict end point. Emma Moench added in the past we have set up the rubric with less points vs you meet it or not at the threshold. Jared Lisonbee added in the code it does state it may not meet a threshold.
- III. Jared Lisonbee went over the scoring remended.
 - A. ECERS
 - 1. ESA Threshold: 3.67 overall; 4 literacy; 4 interaction
 - a) 100 points: meets minimum threshold
 - b) 0 points: does not meet minimum threshold
 - B. Academics

document as presented. Linda Chadburn seconded. The motion was 5 to 5. The motion did not pass.

3rd motion- Amy Terpstra motioned document is to be accepted with exception to no equal weighting. Weighting is to be 40% Academic, 30% ECERS, and 30% PEEP. Jeremias Solari seconded. The motion was 7 to 3. The motion passed.

1. 100 total points
 - a) Determined by PEEP progress score and at risk population
2. PEEP Progress Threshold:
 - (1) 103 PEEP progress score for both Literacy and Numeracy
 - b) Range to threshold (down by 8.325 points)
 - (1) Literacy
 - (a) 33.3 points: 103 - 90.00
 - (b) 24.975 points: 80 - 89.99
 - (c) 16.65 points: 79.99 - 70
 - (d) 8.325 points: 69.99 and below
 - (2) Numeracy
 - (a) 33.3 points: 103 - 90.00
 - (b) 24.975 points: 80 - 89.99
 - (c) 16.65 points: 79.99 - 70
 - (d) 8.325 points: 69.99 and below
3. Percentage of at risk children in the classroom
 - a) Range of points
 - (1) 33.3 points: 100% - 75%
 - (2) 24.975 points: 74.99% - 50%
 - (3) 16.65 points: 49.99% - 25%
 - (4) 8.325 points: 24.99% and below

C. Narrative

1. 100 total points
2. Documentation of programs meeting all elements of High Quality Early Learning programs as designated in code.
 - a) Priority Points
 - (1) Past participation in grant
 - (a) Due to SR Code, priority must be given to those that are
 - (b) currently receiving the award.

D. Sara Weibke asked if it is just for ESA?

1. Emma Moench explained yes due to not having an ECERS observation for becoming. We want to see the gap analysis to see what they need to help with.

E. Trent Kaufman asked if we have sent the new guidelines?

1. Jared Lisonbee informed him no, we have not due to needing approval from the board on the changes and timeline.

- F. Jamie Bitton had asked if there is a resource for providers to access training for the elements of quality, PEEP, etc?
 - 1. Jared Lisonbee informed her that we can look into a seminar and look into the future to give preliminary information to applicants.
- G. Amy Terpstra asked when it comes to equal waiting would we want to change it to be similar to the PEEP?
 - 1. Jared Lisonbee informed her we could do that but those who are not meeting PEEP will not get the scoring.
- H. Rebecca Banner asked if we would have to vote for all timeline changes to send the RFGA out and can we change it once it's been released?
 - 1. Megan Vlaming answered we would need to vote today so we are able to meet the rest of the deadlines. We can release the RFGA later this year but it will throw things off. They will need to send in a letter of intent after the RFGA has been released.
- I. Sara Weibke asked if a letter of intent is needed?
 - 1. Megan Vlaming answered yes we will and can create a conflict of interest if observations are going on with the application is open. It is a best practice for licensing/contracts. The letter of intent informs us of the need for observation.
 - 2. Emma Moench added the letter of intent informs us that they will need an observation after we know they have met the threshold vs going through the work and they don't meet the threshold.
- J. Sara asked if we can change the weight of ECERS to meet the PEEP threshold?
 - 1. Rebecca Banner commented if we were to change the ECERS threshold will it change the way we do it since the grant is to help them become quality.

IV. 1st Motion- Board discussion:

- A. Linda Chadburn addressed the concern that increasing the academic portion may cause the students to have additional pressure that will be counter productive to their learning. ECERS shows more of the strength of the program than what the PEEP is. Linda Chadburn suggested 40/30/30 vs the 50/25/25 Trent Kaufman has suggested.
 - 1. Jeremias Solari informed Trent Kaufman he can amend his motion. Trent Kaufman declined changing the motion.
 - 2. Jared Lisonbee added that Linda Chadburn's comment does make sense based on previous experience it had a negative effect on quality.

	<p>V. Public discussion:</p> <p>A. Katrina wanted to add a comment regarding that funding does go for 3 and 4 year olds. How will PEEP scoring work since we do not do that for 3 year olds? It is not ethical to put that much pressure on a 3 year old.</p> <p>VI. 3rd motion- Board discussion:</p> <p>A. Jamie Bitton asked if we are putting a motion for leaving an assessment that can be manipulated by the assessor and not what someone else is observing?</p> <p>1. Jeremias Solari answered yes.</p> <p>VII. 3rd motion- Public discussion:</p> <p>A. None</p>	
Grant Limit for Becoming High Quality Grantees	Megan Vlaming	Jeremias Solari motioned to table this item to the next meeting. Sara seconded motion. The motion was carried unanimously. The motion was approved.
SY 2022-2023 End of Year Grant Reports	<p>Emma Moench and Jared Lisonbee</p> <p>I. Please review this item in the meeting materials.</p>	
Other Business		
Adjournment	<p>Next Meeting:</p> <p>November 15, 2023</p> <p>1:00pm – 3:00pm</p>	Jeremias Solari called for a motion to adjourn. Amy Terpestra motioned. Jeremias Solari seconded. Meeting adjourned. Motion passed unanimously.